



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

of certain numerals that the portions where these misrenderings occur must be the work of scholars of inferior learning. In forming this judgment, Dr. Pearce was probably influenced by observing the frequent distortions of numerals in the *Orosius* (cf. Schilling, p. 32) alongside of evident blunders in translation. A closer examination of the cases in the *Bede* makes it certain that they, at least, are not due to ignorance of Latin, but to perfectly natural misreading of the characters used to represent the names of the numerals, just such mistakes as we make to-day.

Dr. Pearce points out three cases of 9 for 8, one of 592 for 582, two of 7 for 8, and one each of 8 for 9, 4 for 7, 12 for 13, and 13 for 11. The numbers used were, of course, the Roman, and we must remember that 5 was **v** or **u**, but that **u** might also stand for **ii**, that is 2 (cf. Wattenbach's *Anleitung*, p. 97), and that 4 might appear as **iiii** or **iiij** or **uu** or **uy** or **lul** etc., and that 9 was **iiiiii** or **viii** or **viij** etc. We shall, therefore, expect misreading of numbers, especially if they contain u, or u or x followed by several i's, the mind having to remember not only the number of strokes but also the nature of the preceding character. Expressed in Roman numerals the ten cases in the *Bede* are:—

1	iiii	misread	iiii
2	iiii	"	iiii
3	iiii	"	iiii
4	iiiiii	"	iiii
5	iiii	"	iii
6	iiii	"	iii
7	xiii	"	xii
8	xi	"	xiii
9	dlxxxii	"	dlxxxii
10	iii	"	iii

In other words, in the first seven cases the translator has miscounted by one stroke; in the eighth by two; in the ninth by one character of two strokes; in the tenth case he has made an even more pardonable mistake. The only case that seems stupid is the eighth.

As such slips may occasionally occur to anybody, it is evident that they cannot be used as an argument to prove the presence of different hands in the work of translating the *Bede*.

The mistakes in the *Orosius* present more complicated and even more interesting problems. They reveal different mental tendencies from those betrayed in the *Bede*; for example, inversion: vi for iv and ix for xi. The confusion between x and v is due to the fact that the form of v often approached (for example, **v**) that of x (cf. Wattenbach); its frequency may be judged from the German idiom "einem ein x für ein u (v) machen." The writing **iiiiix** for 45 (*Orosius* 78, 2) shows that the translator (or early copyist) did not consider the real value of the numerals but transferred them mechanically, just as we to-day might read **xxxv** as "four x's (and a) v." This got written "four x," that is **iiii**, and the mind's image of four like characters followed by a different one was satisfied and thus the v was lost.

The determination of the characteristic mistakes of a copyist or translator is of great importance: it furnishes a standard by which to judge of the probability of a mistake implied in a conjectured reading; it may also lead to the identification of the work of a writer, or, in such a case as this, of the original Ms. employed by the translator. For example, **xlv** could never have formed the direct basis of **iiiiix**; but **xxxv** could, as shown above. I shall soon report fully the characteristic mistakes of the copyist of the Lauderdale manuscript of the *Orosius* and have set students at work on other texts.

GEORGE HEMPL.

University of Michigan.

THE SO-CALLED PROSE VERSION OF GUY OF WARWICK.

IN 1889 the late Professor Morley published in vol. iv of the *Carisbrooke Library* a prose romance of *Guy of Warwick*, in the introduction to which he described this version as follows:—

"The next story in our collection is a comic specimen of popular heroics, a tall copy of the widely popular tale of "Guy of Warwick." Its writer towered above common men with eloquence raised high upon the stilts of blank verse that was printed like to prose. Prose has its music, but is always bad when it so runs into successive lines of metre that the artifice is obvious. Such artifice of manner

weakens faith in the sincerity of what it said." "As a metrical romance, 'Guy of Warwick' is as old as the thirteenth century, and has been doubtfully ascribed to a Franciscan friar, Walter of Exeter. The story of Guy is laid in days before the Norman conquest, and associated with the days of King Athelstane and the battle of Brunanburgh. Guy is said to have been the son of Siward, Baron of Wallingford, to have married Felice, only daughter of the Saxon warrior Rohand, to have lived as a hermit after overcoming Colbrond the Dane, and to have died in the year 929. The romance sprang from the life of the twelfth century. In the prose form here given its mediæval spirit is not wholly lost under the fine rhetoric of clothe with which its body is overlaid. The earliest edition of the romance in French prose was printed at Paris in 1525. The earliest edition in English prose was printed by William Copland, who died before 1570."

On reading the romance as edited by Professor Morley one is instantly struck by the rhythm, which is effected not only by the arrangement of words, but also by the use of stops. A large number of sentences and paragraphs may be easily divided off into blank verse. The blank verse so obtained does not conform strictly to the five-accented, ten-syllable type; feminine endings are common, the accent shifts, and there is a freedom of handling that suggests blank verse of late sixteenth century, rather than the more rigid forms before Shakespere. It is after one has admitted with the editor that, as prose, the romance is not agreeable reading, that one turns it into blank verse and examines its metrical qualities, when the marks of good blank verse, noted above, are apparent.

At this point the reader feels surprise that blank verse of this kind should have been written within the lifetime of Copland, and that no further notice has been taken of it. I was therefore prompted to find out, if possible, from the British Museum and the Bodleian Library the exact date of the prose version. Through the kindness of the Librarian of the Bodleian it was learned that that Library had only "a single leaf, corresponding to vv. 10269-10489, ed. Zupitza 1883. [London, W. de Woordt c. 1505];" and "Lhystoire de Guy de vvaruich chevalier d Angleterre [in prose] par Jehan Bonfons, s. a; 4: [before 1550?]. In addition to this there was sent a quotation from Ames

and Herbert *Typog. Antiq.* vol., i. p. 367.

"Guy Earl of Warwick"

Begins:—Sithen the tyme . . .

Ends:—"Here endeth the booke of the moste victorious prynce, Guy of Warwick. Imprynted at London, in Lothbridge . . . by Wyllyam Copland [no date, but between 1548 and 1569] 8o."

The quotation from Ames is short, but it is long enough to show that the language in this edition of Copland is quite different from that in Morley's text. Morley evidently modernized his version throughout, but aside from spelling the beginning and ending of the version described in Ames are also different from the beginning and ending in Morley.

From the British Museum, Dr. Garnett sent the results of a search for a prose version of Guy. He found none. There was an exceedingly imperfect copy of the romance in metre "printed by W. Copland about 1560." Professor Arber added to the negative evidence by finding no entry of a prose version in the Stationer's Register.

The result of the enquiry is plain: where is the 'tall copy' from which Professor Morley took his text? It may have been in one of the many scattered libraries in England, but in any case the source should have been given, otherwise Morley's sentence about Copland's prose version and the facts at hand contradict each other flatly.

In looking for other references to a prose version of *Guy of Warwick* I have met with no better success. Zupitza, in the fourteenth volume of *The Proceedings of the Vienna Academy*, published an article "Zur litteraturgeschichte des Guy von Warwick." I have not been able to get this volume, but from a collateral reference in Tanner's dissertation¹ it seems that the article had to do with M. E. translations from the French. In his edition of the metrical version for the E. E. T. S., Zupitza says nothing about an English prose version.

Before making a careful study of such verse as we may mark off from Morley's text, it

¹ *Die sage von Guy von Warwick*. Heidelberg, Diss. v. A. Tanner, Bonn. 1877. In part v, p. 49 ff. Tanner gives a good list of MSS. and editions; but he makes no mention of an English prose version in print.

would, of course, be necessary to inquire further into the integrity of this text. It has been said that, supposing the prose version to have been printed by Copland, "who died before 1570," the spelling has been modernized. This in itself throws suspicion upon the text as a whole, and possibilities of further editorial changes suggest themselves.

It is certain however that Copland did print a metrical version of *Guy of Warwick*, probably about 1560. If there is anything in the versification to suggest blank verse the fact should be known, for all blank verse or approximations to it at such a date, are important; if on the other hand, Copland's verse was in a different metre, or even in parts in the ten-syllable couplet, that fact should be known, to counteract the impression made by Professor Morley's introduction. But one cannot be far wrong in relying upon Tanner's description of Copland's version. It consists of one hundred and forty-one leaves; it is written—if the rest be like the first four lines—in four-accent couplets, and is printed from Auchinleck Ms. nos. 24 and 54. (Zupitza a.) I have not been able thus far to show that this actually describes the imperfect Copland print in the British Museum, but there seems to be little doubt that it is this print which is so described.

It is unfortunate that we do not know more about Copland. If it could be shown—and the burden of proof is heavy despite Prof. Morley's easy assertion—that Copland printed a prose version of *Guy* between 1545 and 1565, and that lines of very fair blank verse may be cut out of this version, then a codicil would be found to the legacy left by Surrey in his *Aeneid*, and by Sackville and Norton in *Gorboduc*. And with the possibility that here presents itself, it is doubly strange that Morley² did not refer to this rhythmical prose version

² Many of Copland's books were undated. Collier, in his *Extracts from the Stationer's Register*, London, 1848, notes the following:—*Adam Bel* etc., under Kynge's *Adam Bel*, entered 1557-8 (p. 15). *The vij wise Mrs. of Rome*, entered by Marthe 1558-9. Under this entry Collier says "W. Copland published 'the seven wyse Maisters of Rome' without date; but we know of no edition by Marthe" (p. 16). An edition of Copland's *Squire of Low Degree* was published without date before King's edition of 1560 (p. 27). In Copland's edition of *Juventus* a prayer for Elizabeth was inserted where Vele in his edition had a prayer for Edward VI. Un-

in his paragraph on the Italian *versi sciolti* and the beginnings of English blank verse in *English Writers*, vol. viii, pp. 61 and 214.

Some apology might be made for an extended reference to what, perhaps, should not be taken too seriously. But either something more is to be said about the first English blank verse, or else the statement of the late Professor Morley about a contemporary rhythmical prose romance of *Guy of Warwick* should be modified.

W. P. REEVES.

Union College.

NOTES ON HALL'S CONCISE ANGLO-SAXON DICTIONARY. II.

ACCORDING to Hall there is a word *egur* = *eagor*, sn. ?, 'flood, tide, sea.' If we look up the reference given²⁸ we find it to be identical with the *egur* glossing *dodrans* WW. 18, 20, which Hall has entered in the form occurring WW. 368, 29; 474, 4: *egor*, although he did not understand it. If we compare Byrhtferth's *Handboc*, 198 (*Anglia*, viii, 334) *dodrans oððe dodras þæt synt þa nigon dælas*, it would seem that *egur*, *egor*, represents the rest of the mutilated gloss *dodrans* { [*þa n*] *e-gun* [*dælas*]. } { [*þa n*] *e-gon*. } However, as we find WW. 225, 11 *dodrans i. malina egur* and C. G. L. v. 572, 21 *malinas maiores estus* (= *aestus*), and as there is a dialect English *eagre* (*egre*) 'the tidal bore' *egur* may be all right, after all, and *dodrans* a corruption of [*re-*] *dondans* = *redundans* that may represent the remnant of a former *aestus redundans unda i. malina egur*. Examples of such mutilated glosses are by no means rare.

Sweet, however, here (as elsewhere, when hard pressed for an explanation), had paid no attention to the Latin word at all, in fixing the meaning of the word, and Hall entered what he found. Under these circumstances it is a

der entry John Kynge, *Juventus*, Aug. 14, 1560, Collier says "Perhaps he relinquished his right [in the *Juventus*] to William Copland" (p. 29).

Collier gives one entry by Copland in 1560; three in 1561-2; three in 1562-3; one in 1563-4; one in 1565-6; and one in 1567-8. Copland's activity seems to have ended with the last year. *Gorboduc* was entered by 'Wylliam greffeth' in 1565.

²⁸ OET. C². 702.